EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

BELLSOUTH ORIGINAL

Ben G. Almond Vice President-Federal Regulatory Suite 900 1133-21st Street N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036-3351 202 463-4112 Fax 202 463-4198 Internet: almond.ben@bsc.bls.com

July 20, 1999

RECEIVED

JUL 201999

Ms. Magalie Roman Salas Secretary Federal Communications Commission 445 12th Street, SW, Room TW-A325 Washington, DC 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION 67FICE OF THE SECNETARY

RE:

Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI) and other Customer Information, CC Docket 96-115 and Subscriber List Information (SLI), CC Docket 96-116/EX PARTE

Dear Ms. Salas:

This letter is to notify you that on July 16, 1999, Larry Katz of Bell Atlantic, Kathy Rehmer of SBC, Michael Pabian of Ameritech, Elridge Stafford of US West and Ben Almond of BellSouth met on the above referenced subjects with Dorothy Attwood, Legal Advisor in Chairman William E. Kennard's office.

The discussion on CPNI centered on three key issues associated with the outstanding petitions for reconsiderations and forebearance. The first issue briefly discussed was the attached "Proposal for Commission Amendment of Sections 64.2009(a), (c), and (e)", developed by members of the industry as an alternative to the Commission's electronic flagging and auditing rules. This document is currently on record for association with the docket proceeding. The second issue pertains to our fundamental positions that is in the consumer's best interest, consistent with the language of Section 222 and customer expectations, that a carrier may use CPNI, without express approval, to market CPE and information services that are used in the provision of the carrier's telecommunication service offerings. It was briefly discussed that CPNI restrictions should be removed to market customer "winbacks".

No. of Copies rec'd	0+1
List A B C D E	

Finally, positions on record concerning the key issues in the SLI proceeding were briefly discussed including SLI pricing, clearinghouse obligations and the provisioning of directory information over the Internet.

Please associate this notification with the referenced docket proceeding.

If you have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,

Ben G. Almond

Vice President-Federal Regulatory

Sen G. almond

Attachment

C¢: Dorothy Attwood

April 16, 1999

The Honorable William E. Kennard Chairman Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Michael K. Powell Commissioner Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Gloria Tristani Commissioner Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554 The Honorable Susan Ness Commissioner Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

The Honorable Harold Furchtgott-Roth Commissioner Federal Communications Commission The Portals, 445 12th Street, SW Washington, D.C. 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 96-115: CPNI Electronic Safeguards: Written Ex Purie

Dear FCC Chairman and Commissioners:

In anticipation of this matter coming before you shortly on reconsideration, we are writing jointly to emphasize our shared support for the industry's proposed alternative to the "electronic safeguards" requirements adopted in the Second Report and Order.\(^1\)
The alternative proposal, which was presented to the Common Carrier Bureau earlier this year \(^2\) represents the recommendation of a comprehensive, industry-wide coalition of

¹ Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Telecommunications Carriers. Use of Customer Properties Network Information and Other Customer Information, 13 FCC Red 8061 (1998) ("Second Report and Order").

See nonce of ex purie presentation, letter from Celia Nogales, Americach, to Magalia Roman Salas, FCC, Jan 11, 1999 (statement of proposal), letter from Judy Sello, AT&T, to Carol Mattey, FCC, Jan 12, 1999

carriers. We are confident that on review you will agree that the proposed alternative safeguerds will continue to serve the substantive purposes and requirements of the CPNI rules for the benefit of customers while substantially eliminating costly and unnecessary burdens for carriers.¹

In the Second Report and Order, the Commission adopted rules and safeguards pursuant to Section 222 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to govern all carriers use of customer proprietary network information (CPNI). Among the safeguards imposed were: (1) a requirement that carriers develop and maintain an electronic "flag" system to indicate the CPNI approval status of individual customers records: and (2) a requirement that carriers develop and implement an "electronic audit" mechanism that would track access to customer accounts and that would be capable of recording whenever customer records are opened, by whom, and for what purpose.

Numerous carriers from all segments of the industry filed petitions for reconsideration of these electronic safeguard requirements identifying shortcomings in both their legal foundations (inadequate notice and Regulatory Flexibility Act analysis) and their policy foundations (inadequate cost/benefit analysis; drain on IT resources during Y2K initiatives). Thereafter, ten trade associations "representing virtually the entire industry affected by the CPN1 rules" jointly urged the Commission to defer the enforcement date of the electronic safeguard requirements until after the Commission had reconsidered them on their merits. On the strength of these filings, the Commission did defer enforcement of these requirements so that the Commission could "consider [alternative] proposals to tailor [the] requirements more narrowly and to reduce burdens on the industry while serving the purposes of the CPN1 rules."

(supplementary explanatory letter). A copy of the proposal and the supplementary explanatory letter are attached for your convenience.

By joining this letter, none of the signatory associations are changing their positions on any other issues in the CPNI proceeding.

^{*} Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, Telecommunications Carriers' Use of Costomer Proprietary Network Information and Other Customer Information, CC Docket 96-115, Order, FCC 98-239 (ref. Sept. 24, 1998) ("Safeguards Deferral Order")

See: Letter to Chairman Kennard, Commissioner Powell, Commissioner Tristani, Commissioner Ness, and Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth from PCIA, USTA, CTIA, CompTel, OPASTCO, NRTA, Small Business in Telecommunications, ITTA, ACTA, and NTCA, CC Docker No. 96-113 (filed July 20, 1998).

[&]quot; Sufermands Deferral Order at " 4.

Subsequently, on the recommendation of and with facilitation by the Common Carrier Bureau. a diverse group of representatives from the telecommunications industry joined together to propose the attached alternative set of requirements and rule modifications. This proposal squarely meets the Commission's expectations of an alternative approach as set forth in the Safeguards Deferral Order. In its essence, the alternative approach affords differently situated carriers the necessary flexibility to adopt cost-effective means of achieving the objectives that underlie the original flagging and audit requirements, in lieu of a rigid "one requirement fits all" approach. Moreover, the proposal replaces the ineffective and costly obligation to track billions of bits of data regarding access to individual records with an annual review of the efficacy of the carrier's CPNI compliance program. Meanwhile, however, nothing in the alternative proposal would "relieve carriers of the underlying obligations to use CPNI in accordance with section 222 and the Commission's [substantive] implementing rules."

Against the backdrop of this industry unanimity, we also note that there has been no significant consumer interest in this proposal, much less opposition to it. At the urging of the Common Carrier Bureau, consumer advocate groups were invited to the initial industry coalition meeting with the Bureau, and they did attend. A copy of the final consensus proposal was also shared with these groups before its formal presentation and submission to the Bureau. To our knowledge, no group has registered any opposition to the industry proposal with the Commission. We attribute this consumer acquiescence, at least in part, to consumer satisfaction with carrier CPNI policies and an indifference to the internal mechanisms employed by individual carriers to implement those rules. These groups likely also appreciate that the massive costs of the current requirements ultimately would be borne by customers, with no commensurately increased benefits over those achievable through the industry proposal.

See Public Notice, "Common Carrier Bureau Announces Ex Parte Meeting to Discuss Developing an Industry Coalition to Address Software Flagging and Electronic Audit Trucking Requirements of Customer Proprietary Network Information (CPNI)," DA 98-2504 (ref. Dec. 7, 1998)

Sufcenards Deferral Order at 5.

Page 4

Whatever the reason, the record remains clear: the present flagging and audit requirements should be eliminated in favor of the proposed alternative. We collectively and respectively urge the Commission to take this action on reconsideration.

Thomas E. Wheeler President & CEO

Cellular Telecommunications Industry
Association (CTIA)

Lawrence E. Sarjeant

Vice President, Regulatory Affairs and

General Counsel

United States Telephone Association (USTA)

(0317)

Carol Ann Bischoff

Executive Vice-President and General

Counsel

Competitive Telecommunications

Association (CompTel)

Jill Canfield

Regulatory Counsel

National Telephone Cooperative

Association (NTCA)

Sincerely.

Stuart Polikoff

Director of Government Relations Organization for the Protection and

Advancement of Small Telecommunications

Companies (OPASTCQ)

David W. Zesiger .

Executive Director

Independent Telephone-&

Telecommunications Alliance (ITTA)

Silvia Lesse

Legal Counsel

Independent Alliance

Rural Cellular Association

Robert Schwaniger

Principal General Courses

Small Business in Telecommunications

Thomas Power, Legal Advisor, Office of the Chairman Ari Fitzgerald, Legal Advisor, Office of the Chairman

Novin Martin, Logal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth

Paul Misener, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Furchtgott-Roth Kyle Dixon, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Powell
Peter A. Tenhula, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Powell
Linda Kinney, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Ness
Dan Connors, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Ness
Paul Gallant, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Tristani
Karen Gulick, Legal Advisor, Office of Commissioner Tristani
Larry Strickling, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Bob Atkinson, Deputy Chief, Common Carrier Bureau
Carol Mattey, Chief, Policy Division, Common Carrier Bureau
Thomas J. Sugrue, Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Diane Cornell, Associate Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau
Christopher Wright, General Counsel, FCC
Jeanine Poltronieri, Senior Counsel, FCC

bcc:

Common Carrier Bureau Staff

Margaret Egler
Anthony Mastendo
Eric Einhorn
Cece Stephens
Florence Grasso

bcc:

Wireless Telecommunications Bureau Staff

John Cimko Nancy Booker Peter Wolfe